[30th October 1935

(c) whether the district boards were required to complete the works by 30th June 1935;

(d) whether any of the district boards applied for either extension of time or further grants;

(e) if the answer to (d) is in the affirmative, what the orders of the Government are; and

(f) whether representations from the general public have been received requesting the Government to continue the works as the season had not improved?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b)

Name of District Board.	Amount sanctioned during 1935-36.	
	Road works.	Water-supply.
	RS.	RS.
1 Anantapur	45,000	1,500
2 Cuddapah	50,000	2,000
3 Kurnool	20,500	3,500
4 Coimbatore	12,187	..
5 Trichinopoly	5,000	5,000
6 Tinnevelly	27,500	..
7 Chittoor	Nil.	7,000

(c) Yes, originally.

(d) Yes.

(e) Extension of time was granted in the following cases:—

(i) *in respect of road works*—

Kurnool District Board .. Trichinopoly District Board ..	Up to the end of July 1935.
Cuddapah District Board .. Coimbatore District Board ..	Up to the end of August 1935.

An additional grant of Rs. 15,000 has been sanctioned for the Cuddapah District Board and an application for a further grant of Rs. 30,000 has just been received from the Anantapur District Board and is under consideration.

(ii) *in respect of water-supply works*—

Cuddapah District Board .. Up to the end of July 1935.

(f) A representation from the Ryots' Association, Anantapur, was received on 5th July 1935.

Allotment of funds to district boards from the Road Development Fund for execution of schemes approved by the Board of Communications.

* 283 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the schemes for which money from the Road Development Fund has been applied for by each district board this year;

30th October 1935]

(*b*) the schemes approved out of each such list by the Board of Communications; and

(*c*) the schemes for which funds have been allotted by the Road Development Fund and the amount granted to each district board this year?

A.—(*a*) The district boards do not generally submit separate lists of schemes to be financed from the Road Development Fund. From the applications for grants in 1935–36 received from them, items of work involving large expenditure have been selected for being financed from the Road Development Fund.

(*b*) A list of schemes approved by the Board of Communications is appended.[a]

(*c*) A list of schemes for which grants have been allotted from the Road Development Fund is appended.[a]

Repairs to the Kundah bridge, the Nilgiris.

* 284 *Q.*—Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether representations were made by the Nilgiris District Board, the Engineer of the District Board and the public of the Nilgiris as to the dangerous condition of the Kundah bridge in the Nilgiris;

(*b*) the date or dates of the representations received by the Government; and

(*c*) what action the Government took or propose to take to put the bridge in safe condition?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) In November 1933, the Nilgiris District Board applied for a grant for the redecking of the Kundah Bridge which was reported to be in a dangerous condition. The application was received too late for consideration in connexion with the budget for 1934–35 and the Board was informed accordingly. The application was renewed in August 1934. As the bridge was on a road which was neither a trunk road nor a second-class road, it was not eligible for a grant from provincial funds, and a grant was therefore not sanctioned. The Government propose to apply to the Government of India for sanction to the debit of the expenditure to the Road Development Account.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"May I know under what class the road on which the Kundah bridge stands comes?"

The Hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Third-class or village road."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix III on pages 221–222 infra.